

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, and 65-76 are pending in this application. Claims 17, 19, 21-26, 29, 30, 34, 37, 38, 42, 45, 46, 50, 53, 54, 58, 60 and 61 are amended. Claims 65-76 are newly added. Claims 22, 25, 30, 33, 38, 41, 46, 49, 54, 57, 61, and 64 are cancelled. Applicants submit no new matter is added by the claim amendments and/or new claims.

Information Disclosure Statements

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the references included in the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 31, 2008. Applicants respectfully request consideration of the references included in the Information Disclosure Statements filed March 31, 2008; April 14, 2008; May 5, 2008; May 21, 2008; and June 20, 2008.

Claim Objections

Claim 17 is objected to for including a typographical error. Claims 17 is amended to change "film" to "file". Therefore, Applicants request the claim objection be withdrawn.

Amendments to Independent Claims

Before turning to the outstanding art rejections, Applicants take this opportunity to emphasize amendments to the independent claims that are believed to further clarify the claims and further distinguish the claims over the cited references as explained later. For example, independent claim 17 is amended to recite the following.

17. A computer-readable medium storing a data structure for managing reproduction of at least video data representing multiple reproduction paths, comprising:

a data area storing a transport stream of at least video data, the transport stream being divided into transport packets, each of the transport packets associated with one of the multiple reproduction paths, and the transport packets of each reproduction path being stored as a separate file from one another such that different reproduction paths represent different video data, and

a navigation area storing a first navigation unit, the first navigation unit including one or more second navigation units and controlling a reproduction order of the second navigation units, at least one second navigation unit referencing more than one third navigation unit and including an indicator for indicating that the corresponding at least one second navigation unit is provided for the multiple reproduction paths, each third navigation unit associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths and identifying a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce.

Applicants note that at least the above-emphasized features of independent claim 17 are believed to distinguish over the cited references. Applicants note that each of independent claims 26, 34, 42, 50 and 58 recite somewhat similar features.

Example Embodiments providing Support for Claim Amendments

This section is provided to identify support for the above-emphasized features of amended claim 17 and the similar features of independent claims 26, 34, 42, 50 and 58. In particular, Applicants note that paragraph [0057] of Applicants' specification states "the program type 'PG_TY', besides 'Protect' flag, includes 'S/M' flag and the 3-bit number of channels 'Channel_Ns'." As described in paragraph [0052], "the 'S/M' indicates whether an associated PG includes a single-channel or a multi-channel stream." Further, the example embodiment of FIG. 4 illustrates the 'PG_TY' is included in the program information (PGI#n) and the example embodiment of FIG. 7 illustrates that PGI #1 is associated with more than one PTMAP.

Applicants note that these portions of the specification provide for managing single and multiple reproduction paths.

Applicants submit that at least the above identified portions of Applicants' specification provide support for the following feature of amended claim 17: "at least one second navigation unit referencing more than one third navigation unit and including an indicator for indicating that the corresponding at least one second navigation unit is provided for the multiple reproduction paths," as well as the similar features of independent claims 26, 34, 42, 50 and 58.

As an example, Applicants note the first navigation unit recited in the independent claims may correspond to the PGCI of FIG. 7, the second navigation unit may correspond to the PGI #1 in FIG. 7, the third navigation units may correspond to the PTMAPS of FIG. 7, and the indicator may correspond to the 'S/M' included in the program type P_TY of FIG. 4, which is included in the PGCI. Applicants submit that at least the above identified portions of the specification provide support for the above-emphasized feature of independent claim 17 and may aid the Examiner in understanding how the claims of this application differ from the cited references as further explained below.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17, 19, 21-26, 28-34, 36-42, 44-50 and 52-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Okada (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0046328, herein Okada) in view of Yamane et al. (EP 0 847 198 B1, herein Yamane). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

Initially, Applicants submit that the claims submitted in the Amendment filed November 20, 2007 distinguish over the cited references of Okada and Yamane. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, the Applicants have further narrowed the claims.

As such, even assuming the Examiner's assertions regarding Okada and Yamane are correct, which Applicants do not admit, the combination of Okada and Yamane still fail to disclose, teach or suggest "at least one second navigation unit referencing more than one third navigation unit and including an indicator for indicating that the corresponding at least one second navigation unit is provided for the multiple reproduction paths," as recited in independent claim 17. As previously mentioned, claims 26, 34, 42, 50 and 58 recite somewhat similar features.

In particular, even assuming the header of the A-ILVUb2 shown in FIG. 49 can be considered the second navigation unit as alleged by the Examiner, the header does not include an indicator for indicating that the A-ILVUb2 is provided for multiple reproduction paths. At most, the header provides a next address, which may be a different angle in order to change from VOB-B to VOB-C or VOB-D. However, this is not equivalent to an indicator specifically indicating that the second navigation unit is provided for multiple reproduction paths rather than a single reproduction path.

Therefore, Applicants the rejections of each of the independent claims, as well as all claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully request that new claims 65-76 be considered and allowed.

CONCLUSION

Allowance of each of the pending claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott A. Elchert at the telephone number of the undersigned below since previous telephone conversations have seemed helpful.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

 55,149

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
Scott A. Elchert, Reg. No. 55,149
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/SAE/ame